

Berry Petroleum Company

5201 Truxtun Avc., Suite 300 Bakersfield, CA 93309-0640 (661) 616-3900 www.bry.com

October 11, 2005

California Energy Commission Dockets Unit Attn: Docket No. 04-IEP-1K 1516 Ninth Street, MS-4 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512 DOCKET
04-IEP-1 K
DATE OCT 11 2008
RECD. OCT 12 2008

Subject:

04 IEP 1K Committee Draft Document Hearings

Dear Commissioners and Staff:

Berry Petroleum Company ("Berry") would again like to complement the California Energy Commission ("Commission") on its recognition of the many benefits that combined heat & power ("CHP" or "cogeneration") facilities have provided, and will continue to provide to California. We thank the Commission for this opportunity to submit comments regarding the well written 2005 IEPR Committee Draft Report, dated September 2005.

Berry respectfully requests that the Commission correct a comment attributed to the undersigned that does not accurately reflect Berry's situation as discussed during my participation in the April 28, 2005 workshop. In the last paragraph on Page 64 the report states:

"In one instance, Berry Petroleum physically removed its CHP systems entirely and installed traditional boilers to meet its heating needs because of the administrative difficulties of renewing long standing utility power purchase arrangements.⁹³"

During the energy crisis of 2000 – 2001, Berry Petroleum needed additional steam to expand its EOR production and prepared applications to construct two new cogeneration facilities in addition to those it already owned and operated. Because Berry could not secure long-term power purchase agreements for the new facilities, it was forced to install traditional boilers to provide the additional steam necessary for its expanded oil production. Berry also had problems renewing the contracts for its existing CHP facilities, but those facilities have not been removed, and continue to operate despite such problems. A more accurate reflection of Berry's situation would be in the order of the following:

California Energy Commission October 11, 2005 Page 2

"During the California Energy Crisis of 2000 – 2001, Berry needed additional steam for enhanced oil recovery and was willing to install additional CHP facilities to provide that steam. Berry was ultimately forced to install traditional boilers to meet that increased steam need, rather than new CHP facilities, because it could not secure a viable long-term contract for the excess electricity from the CHP facilities.⁹³"

Please feel free to reword the proposed replacement language.

Yours truly,

Barry J Lovell

Consultant to Berry Petroleum Company